

IOWA HIGHWAY RESEARCH BOARD

Minutes of June 1, 2001

Regular Board Members Present

J. Adam	K. Mahoney
J. George	T. Myers
L. Greimann	M. Nahra
D. Julius	J. Odgaard
B. Keierleber	J. Selmer
R. Krauel	

Alternate Board Members Present

L. Brehm for W. Weiss	S. Andrle
R. Gould for S. Larson	G. Miller
C. Van Buskirk for D. Osipowicz	B. Younie
J. Weber for J. Witt	

Board Members With No Representation

None

Secretary

M. Dunn

Visitors

Dave Feree	<i>Attorney General's Office</i>
Jenny Balis	<i>Federal Highway Administration</i>
Bob Given	<i>Iowa Concrete Paving Association</i>
Gordon Smith	<i>Iowa Concrete Paving Association</i>
Sara Buseman	<i>Iowa Department of Transportation</i>
Ed Engle	<i>Iowa Department of Transportation</i>
Elijah Gansen	<i>Iowa Department of Transportation</i>
Ian MacGillivray	<i>Iowa Department of Transportation</i>
Wally Rippie	<i>Iowa Department of Transportation</i>
Bob Stanley	<i>Iowa Department of Transportation</i>
Bob Steffes	<i>Iowa Department of Transportation</i>
Tom Welch	<i>Iowa Department of Transportation</i>
Anita Cody	<i>Iowa State University</i>
Robert Cody	<i>Iowa State University</i>
F. Wayne Klaiber	<i>Iowa State University</i>
Sara Somsy	<i>Iowa State University</i>
Reg Souleyrette	<i>Iowa State University</i>
J. (Hans) van Leeuwen	<i>Iowa State University</i>
David J. White	<i>Iowa State University</i>
Zachary Hans	<i>Iowa State University, CTRE</i>
Ali Kamyab	<i>Iowa State University, CTRE</i>
Hosin "David" Lee	<i>The University of Iowa</i>
Kirk Henderson	<i>University of Northern Iowa</i>

The meeting was held in the Large Materials Conference Room at the Iowa Department of Transportation, Ames, Iowa. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 A.M. by John Adam.

Agenda Review/Modification

- No changes.

Approval of the Minutes

- Randall Krauel moved to accept the minutes from the April 27, 2001 meeting with no additions or corrections. Lyle Brehm seconded. Carried, with 14 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstaining.

Discussion of location for the June 29, 2001 meeting

- Due to the situation of video conferences on September 28 and October 26 overriding the IHRB schedule for the Large Materials Conference Room, it was decided to keep the June 29 meeting at the DOT (in the Large Material Conference Room) and have the September meeting be the alternate site meeting this year. Jacob Odgaard will look into the details for having the September 28 meeting at the National Advanced Driving Simulator in Iowa City. He will report on this at the next meeting.

Problem Statement, “Soil Stabilization of Non-Uniform Subgrade Soils”

- Dr. David White from ISU presented the idea of a partnership among the IHRB, industry, and The Innovative Pavement Research Foundation to sponsor this project. He reviewed the background information, research objectives, field and lab components, time frame, and cost of the research.
- FYI: The Innovative Pavement Research Foundation was established to conduct applied research, technology transfer, and education specifically in the area of PCC. One of their tasks as a research organization, is not only to conduct research on Portland Cement Concrete, but also to conduct research specifically on recycled and waste products. That’s where this project fits into their scope. The way their program is set up is that they are looking to spend anywhere from \$50,000 to \$100,000 per year. This project asks for \$35,000 per year.
- Tom Myers moved that Dr. White bring a proposal back to the board if and when he gets approval from The Innovative Pavement Research Foundation. Jim George seconded.
- It was discussed that The Innovative Pavement Research Foundation requires that the researcher identify for them how the matching funds would be provided. Due to this information, Tom Myers modified the motion to have Dr. White bring a proposal to the next IHRB meeting. If the proposal is accepted at that time, put a ceiling cap on it, not to exceed \$70,000. It was agreed by the second, Jim George. Carried, with 14 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstaining.

Proposal , “Re-Use of Lime Sludges from Water Softening”

- Dr. J. (Hans) van Leeuwen, ISU, brought this proposal to the board, as requested, as follow up to the problem statement presented at the April meeting. He presented background information, including different chemical stages of lime; current problems with disposal; objectives and proposed uses; cost; and time frame of the study.
- Tom Myers moved to accept the proposal. Randall Krauel seconded.
- Discussion included the need for a more detailed written work plan and the involvement of an advisory board.
- Dr. van Leeuwen reviewed some of the research/work plan including testing of various subgrades for content, having lime sludge be integrated into a road project then testing and monitoring results. He also mentioned the tests at power stations and cement plants.
- Dr. van Leeuwen stated that the DOT will be providing advisory services. He had also been in contact with Dale Harrington and David White about teaming up due to the connections with the previous presentation. There is no formal advisory group formed yet, but it would be possible to set one up for the project.
- Being familiar with the problems that Ames, Des Moines, and Cedar Rapids are having, Tom Myers volunteered to be a contact to help make sure that roads are available for this study.
- The motion was carried. 14 yes, 0 no, 0 abstained. Funding amount is \$27,433 (25% Primary and 75% Street).

Final Report, HR-360, “Field Evaluation of Engineering Fabrics for Asphalt Concrete Resurfacing - Audubon County”

- Ed Engle, DOT, reviewed the location, the history of the road, the process involved with applying both types of fabrics, the results of crack surveys, and a final analysis of the final report, HR-360. He displayed a “typical” core sample from the project.
- Randall Krauel moved to accept the report. Mark Nahra seconded. Carried. 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstained. Funding amount was \$30,290 (100% Secondary).

Final Report, TR-431, “Reduction of Concrete Deterioration by Ettringite Using Crystal Growth Inhibition Techniques”

- Dr. Robert Cody, ISU, presented information for the final report TR-431. He reviewed information on ettringite, and reported on the results of the tests run with different crystal growth inhibitors and the reduction in the amount of damage in concrete due to the inhibitors.
- After a question from the board if there are certain areas in the state effected more heavily by ettringite, Dr. Cody mentioned that there is a quality control group of the DOT that has some information on a few highways in the state that have a higher amount of ettringite growth and

that are deteriorating quite badly.

- Christie Van Buskirk moved to accept the final report. Doug Julius seconded. Carried. 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining. Funding amount was \$139,236 (90% Primary and 10% Secondary).

Final Report, TR-442, “Systematic Identification of High Crash Locations”

- Dr. Reg Souleyrette, ISU-CTRE, reviewed the project team, problem statement, 5 topic areas for crashes, crash data of those areas, the system for identifying high crash locations, and samples of signing used to alert drivers of those high risk areas.
- Jim George moved to accept the final report. Randall Krauel seconded. Carried. 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining. Funding amount was \$126,235 (75% Primary, 22% Secondary, and 3% Street).

Review of Competitive Proposal Form

- General comments and decisions made about the Competitive Proposal Form included the following:
 - S It was a good document to work from. It gave something substantial on which to compare the proposals.
 - S It worked very well. It’s subjective enough that there is some latitude in the decision that you want to make as an individual.
 - S A recommendation may be to give the people who submit a proposal the review sheets so they know what factors our committee reviews. They can then be sure to address the proper items and cover everything. The form can be put on the web page for easy access also.
 - S If a committee member wants to put competing proposals on one form, to compare easier, that can be done (use A, B, & C, or 1, 2, & 3 assigned to each proposal for example).
 - S It would be useful for the review comments to be given to the proposer. Mark Dunn will change the form to include a summary comment sheet to be turned into him at the meeting that the proposal is reviewed. These comments will then be consolidated and given to the proposer as feedback. This way, comments that may be of use to the proposer but are not shared at the meeting, can get back to him or her, along with the areas that were discussed. This will be done for both those who do receive support for a project and those who do not. All comments would remain anonymous.
 - S It was suggested to compact the form a bit. Take out the “Suggested Evaluation Techniques” instructional notes and the front page summary (there is an “Overall Rating of the Proposal” page). Make the font smaller and take out some of the writing area.
 - S With close quality proposals, it may be helpful for the board members to create a point system (on there own) for comparison instead of using the more general categories of “poor - fair - good - very good - excellent”. Another idea on the same line, is to give a plus or minus in the “good” (or whichever) category to help differentiate between proposals.
- Mark Dunn will make the recommended changes and have master copies available. It will also

be put on the web page for access and copies can be printed from there as needed by anyone.

Discussion of the Process Necessary to Review Proposals from Solicitation

- With 12 proposals coming in from the solicitations, it was decided to review only half of the proposals at this meeting (a memo had gone out prior to the meeting). The suggested approach is to have discussion on each one, then have a vote to select one of the group (in the case of competing proposals), and have a second vote to actually approve the proposal. This way, if there is a wide spread disagreement on which one to choose, the board would have to come to a concurrence on choosing one from the group, then approve the chosen proposal by a majority (8 yes votes needed to approve a proposal) of the board.
- With the board facing issues of competing proposals due to the new business practices, discussion was necessary to establish guidelines for the following issues.
- Dave Feree, Assistant Attorney General for the State of Iowa and general council to the Iowa Department of Transportation, was asked to be present to answer a few questions. It was established that due to the board's structure of not being a public body, the IHRB did not fall under Iowa's Open Meetings Laws and therefore could make decisions to the following issues according to the preferences of the majority of the board.
- ***There was discussion on voting by show of hands or by written (secret) vote.*** The members voiced opinions that were in support of voting by show of hands. (Motion was made on this issue along with the following item of discussion.)
- ***There was also discussion about board members that represent an institution that has a proposal on the floor and if they should be excused from voting and/or discussion as well; possibly, even having them step out of the room during discussion and voting on their proposals. Comments and discussion items included the following:***
 - S The two discussed the most were the university representatives, however, this situation could affect any member of the board that has an active interest in a proposal.
 - S It was mentioned that Lowell Greimann and Jacob Odgaard's observations would be missed if they couldn't participate in the discussion.
 - S One suggestion was having them available to answer questions, but abstain from voting.
 - S Lowell Greimann and Jacob Odgaard expressed the desire to not participate in discussion, to abstain from voting and wondered about leaving the room or not. There is a struggle in their positions of trying to be objective and wanting to be supportive of their institution and researchers. This could be perceived by different people different ways.
 - S Having them stay in the room may be beneficial so they are able to take the comments back to their staff.
 - S One suggestion was when there are competing proposals, from institutions represented by people on the board, they would abstain from voting and discussion. They would not be asked to leave the room.

- S There could possibly be wording in the rules and regulations for NCHRP that we could look to help phrase this. Mark Dunn will check on this.
- S Steve Andrie mentioned that having worked for TRB and NCHRP for 7 years, he knew that they were very strict on this matter. The rule there was that the person with dual interests as a panel member and a supporter of a proposal, could not even attend that meeting. NCHRP has been doing this for 30 years.
- **Motion:** Mark Nahra made a motion to vote on proposals by open vote, with the university representatives abstaining on competitive proposals. It would be an open vote by the DOT, county and city representatives; the people who are paying the money for the research. An individual member has the option of abstaining if they feel there is a conflict of interest and that it would be appropriate to abstain (i.e. if the project is by county or the DOT). Tom Myers seconded.
 - S *Discussion on motion.* What if the competition is not involving a university, instead it is between the DOT and a county?
 - S *Note:* Our current solicitations do not go outside of Iowa.
 - S With this approach, the universities would never be voting on competing solicited proposals.
 - S It may be more important to remove the conflicting parties, not focus on just the universities.
 - S The DOT members represent the whole department and are party to approximately 90% of the projects. To have all 4 members removed from voting would not be beneficial.
 - S If the proposal is county related, the same situation applies as the above comment about the DOT (all county reps abstaining). For this reason, the focus would have to be narrowed to a direct conflict of interest.
 - S It is not the intention to restrict full groups of members from voting.
 - S There is a need for a definition to be developed for “conflict of interest”. As an example, if it would directly benefit yourself, your family, or your work situation, or if the money is going to come back to you. If a member falls into that category for a proposal, they would not vote.
- **Revised Motion:** Mark Nahra revised the motion to state that in the case of competing proposals, board member(s) with a “conflict of interest” will abstain from the vote and discussion. A definition for “conflict of interest” will be developed in writing to be seen at the next meeting. The individual member will, by interpretation of that definition and ethics, decide if that conflict exists. Aspect of open vote still stands in this motion. The second, with these changes, was still supported by Tom Myers. Carried. 14 yes, 1 no, 0 abstaining.
- Mark Dunn and Ian MacGillivray will work on the definition of “conflict of interest”.
- **Comments and discussion on the option of having a closed meeting and the issue of relying strictly on what is in the written proposal versus having dialog allowed with a proposer(s) during the meeting included the following:**
 - S For this group of proposals, it was made clear that the proposers were welcome to come and answer any questions that may come up that couldn’t be answered by the board, but that they would not be given a presentation time/opportunity.
 - S Ian MacGillivray reminded the board that during the process of developing this, that there

was an emphasis that everything to be evaluated and shared with the board, was to be submitted in the written proposals. The board had specifically discussed the idea of presentations, including when they are competing proposals, and said that they would go on the record of what it is that is in front of them. So it has not been provided for, nor requested that the proposers need to be present. If the board wishes to direct staff to change directions with that, that can be done.

- S It is important that a set rule be established for the proposers. Are they welcome at the meeting and are they going to be given a chance to speak or at least answer questions? This needs to be kept fair just incase some are here and some aren't.
- S *Differing opinions were voiced as follows:* Have the researchers present but silent and rely strictly on what is submitted in written form.
- S Having the researchers there to answer questions was also supported. (i.e. clarification on roadside managers versus highway authority and county engineers' involvement on the Manual for Roadside Control of Trees and Brush proposal)
- S The above item may be something that the proposer would learn for the next proposal.
- S If the researchers do present any information, have the competing proposers leave the room so they are not collecting information from anyone else's presentation.
- S In the NCHRP, the proposers are not present and it does help the comments.
- S A note about TRB, which is a similar advisory board just larger in scope, that was mentioned, was that their committee meetings can have visitors present, but the record is kept confidential and isn't shared with anyone else but the members.
- S If the meeting is a closed meeting, members may be more apt to express their opinions, than if it is an open meeting. We might not get as full of a dialog with an open meeting. With knowing the researcher, it may effect what someone would say in a public forum. There would be other factors that may limit some in how they evaluate a proposal, depending on their relationship with the proposer. With a more open dialog (closed meeting), board members may be more satisfied with the business conducted due to more complete discussion to reach a decision.
- S Kirk Henderson from University of Northern Iowa pointed out that the letter that came with the request for proposals, stated (3rd paragraph) that the proposals may be "accepted or modified as a basis for accepting", which to some extent implies negotiation and communication at some point.
- S It was clarified that the above mentioned item is handled by staff as directed by the board as a result of discussion during a meeting.
- S Another opinion of the above issue is that the board would possibly rather address the questions to the proposers rather than having to go through staff.
- S How much alteration would the board allow the proposer to make though, when there's competing proposals on the line?
- S It was discussed that the board may want to select from among the competing proposals initially, without verbal input from the proposers. Then after selection, if there are further questions on the chosen proposal, iron out any specifics with that proposer at that time.
- S It was clarified that what is submitted to the board in response to a solicitation is the final proposal, no further presentation or written documentation is necessary (unless requested by the board for clarification which would exceed staff scope).

- **Motion:** Mark Nahra moved that the proposals will be considered as written. This would mean no comments from the gallery. The board reserves the right to meet with the researcher of the selected proposal for any changes/clarifications for that project. Lyle Brehm seconded. Carried. 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining.

The following motions were made and discussed simultaneously:

- **Motion:** Mark Nahra made a motion that anyone with a proposal under consideration (a named researcher on the proposal), leave the room while the board is making its decision. Jim George seconded.
 - S *Discussion:* The issue was brought up about the proposer bringing someone with them (not expressly on the proposal as a researcher) and he/she staying in the room to listen, defeats the purpose of having the proposer stay out.
 - S A concern was expressed if the board would have the most open discussion if the proposer was in the room. For instance if there was a past experience causing concern with an individual, are you going to bring that up if they are in the room?
 - S A response to the above comment was that it should be brought up.
 - S As long as the proposer isn't participating in the discussion, there was support shown for allowing them in the room.
 - S Another point mentioned was that too often times boards have suppressed discussion and that is something that we need to rise above.
 - S The previous point was supported. It is our role as professionals in public service and we do need to rise above it (with regards to proposers or anyone else being in the room).
- Motion lost. 0 yes, 15 no, 0 abstaining.
- **Motion:** Mark Nahra moved that the room be totally closed during the review of competitive proposals. John Selmer seconded.
 - S *Discussion:* In respect to the proposer, there is value in knowing what the comments and concerns are. Perhaps that is addressed in the written comments that Mark Dunn will be getting back to the proposers.
 - S NCHRP sends comments back to every proposer.
 - S If it would be a closed meeting, alternate members would still be allowed in the room.
 - S There may be fairness to having the proposers not be here, but to entirely close the meeting to guests and staff, some members were not comfortable with.
 - S Again, there was support for rising above the concerns of having an open meeting. As professionals, this goes with the responsibility of being a board member.
- Motion lost. 1 yes, 14 no, 0 abstaining.
- **Summary:** There will be an open vote; the meeting will be open to visitors, including proposers; there will be no discussion allowed from proposers; and any board member with a conflict of interest (which will be defined) will not participate in discussion or vote on a competitive proposal.
- These procedural items discussed are recommended to be added to the business plan.

Initial Review of Proposals from 2nd Solicitation

- Due to the time necessary for completing the process for competitive proposals, it was decided to review the two proposals that have only one submission and wait with the competing topic until next meeting.

Initial Review of Living Snow Fences from 2nd Solicitation

- One thing that was mentioned as needing more of a focus in this project, was the complaint by property owners that leaving a couple rows of standing corn (or actual fence) causes a problem with a concentration of moisture in the spring. A possible addition would be a study to see if there is a change with yield due to this. Until you prove benefits/costs to the farmers, they will probably not change their views.
- There are programs out there that have farmers leave the crops, the Boy Scouts pick it, and the farmers use that for a tax deduction and actually get paid for it twice. The DNR also has a set aside program now. It would be helpful if this compensation information is in the report.
- We have a number of places across the state that we have had voluntary (not paid) land. If there was a serious proven detriment, it seems that we wouldn't have the people signing up continually like we do. The best marketing is the success stories that the individuals pass on to the neighbors about the benefits they contribute in a societal way of helping with snow retention, visibility and accumulation. As for the yield issue, we have locations identified, we could probably go back and establish whether yield issues are a problem or not. There are a number of staff throughout the state that are involved in snow fence issues (including the Winter Program Manager in Maintenance). It seems like much of this is duplicate of what has been done. We need to get the two together.
- The proposal did mention marketing, but didn't go into great detail. One thing that could be beneficial is if Wilfrid Nixon work with the DOT marketing staff to come up with a good marketing plan at the conclusion of this project.
- One broad issue brought up with solicitation requests was that as a board, we have a responsibility to make sure that the solicitation is accurate and that the proposal is responsive to the solicitation. One of the criteria we have to evaluate a proposal, is if it responds correctly to the solicitation. The emphasis on marketing was not spelled out in the solicitation. Do we have the wrong solicitation by fault of the board? What has been brought up in discussion is important, but we need to be careful on setting a precedence on this procedural issue.
- The board still maintains the right to bring people back to make addendums or deletions. In this case, it would be good to see extra in marketing, but we shouldn't ignore documented research. Yes, we know it works, but does the farmer know the same thing that we do? Having this document in hand, could help sell the idea.
- The problem isn't with the farmer knowing if it would work, it's a matter of having him know that it won't cause damage, or at least having a documented amount of damage so he knows he is being fairly compensated on that.

- The solicitation states to collect data, demonstrate to an individual that it work (benefits of it), to help market the program and get people on board. It is what it is being asked for.
- But the solicitation doesn't get specific enough on how to market it. That is a fault on the part of the board.
- We can have a county and a DOT representative be on an advisory board for this.
- Lyle Brehm moved to accept the proposal subject to adding the marketing issues discussed, including the determination of the economic loss suffered and the benefit gained. The intent is to not have a need for the proposal to come before the board again, unless there is a change in budget due to the change in focus. Funding is proposed to be 50% Primary and 50% Secondary (total amount of \$89,971). Lowell Greimann seconded. Carried. 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining.
- Mark Dunn and Ian MacGillivray will be responsible for these issues being brought to Wilfrid Nixon's attention and that an advisory committee be set up to help steer the research.

An additional comment was made on proposals

- Credentials of the researcher(s) has a section on the evaluation sheet, and should be included in each proposal. This could be a deciding factor in competing proposals. As they are made aware of the criteria of review, when the next round of solicitations are sent out, the researchers will likely follow the evaluation outline.

Initial Review of Manual for Roadside Control of Trees and Brush from 2nd Solicitation

- In looking through the proposal, it was hard to do part of the evaluation due to not knowing who is going to be the consultant. It is a substantial part of the budget.
- Ian MacGillivray commented that there would be the same type of requirements applied to sub-contracts as to contracts in terms of review, qualifications etc.. This will have to be made clear in the solicitation process in the future. The rate is right on target for this kind of research. If there are any issues at all during the contract negotiation stage, it will be back here before the board and/or it will be a different contractor. If the board would like to hear a report and/or have that information shared after staff clarify that, it could be done.
- This is a needed manual, but the approach is very critical. There is also clarification needed on which authority will be involved in the process (roadside managers and/or highway authority and county engineers). There are safety issues involved (examples given), and those involved in that liability need to have input from their perspective for this research.
- There was also a desire for an evaluation plan to be more spelled out. What is being evaluated and how.
- Lyle Brehm moved to table the proposal until the next meeting, pending further review by DOT staff. Kevin Mahoney seconded. Carried. 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining.

- If anyone has any further issues that need addressed, please get those into Mark Dunn so he can act on them before the next meeting.

New Business

- There was a request that the time frame that is allowed for speakers be controlled like it was in the past. Speakers were allowed 7 minutes to present and 8 minutes to answer questions. Also before comments are made, have the member, alternate, and/or visitor state their name prior to speaking.

John Adam adjourned the meeting.

Date of Next Meeting:

THE NEXT MEETING WILL BE HELD JUNE 29, 2001 (the May meeting was adjusted to avoid having it the Friday before Memorial Day, so June has 2 meetings) AT 9:00 A.M. IN THE LARGE MATERIALS CONFERENCE ROOM AT THE IOWA DOT.

Mark Dunn, IHRB Secretary